

Remarks/Arguments

In the Office Action of June 25, 2007, claim 6 was objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim (claim 1), but would be deemed to be allowable if rewritten in independent format including all the limitations of the base claim (claim 1) and any intervening claims (claim 5).

Objected to claim 6 was dependent from claim 5, and claim 5 was dependent from independent claim 1. Accordingly, in response to the objection of claim 6, independent claim 1 has been amended to include all the limitations of claims 5 and 6. Hence, amended claim 1, as presented herein should now be in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 5-6 have been canceled pursuant to this paper.

Furthermore, because the subject matter of amended claim 1 is now allowable, dependent claims 2-4, which include all the limitations of allowable independent claim 1 must also be in condition for allowance.

Finally, rejected claims 7-11 should also be in condition for allowance because they are either directly or indirectly dependent from amended claim 1, and include all the limitations of allowable claim 1.


The remaining claims, namely rejected claims 12-13, have been canceled pursuant to this paper.

In summation, the rejections of claims 1-3 and 10 appearing in Par. 2; the rejection of claims 4-5 and 11 in Par. 4; the rejection of claims 7 and 12 in Par. 5; the rejection of claims 8 and 13 in Par. 6; and the rejection of claim 9 in Par. 7 are all obviated in view of this paper.

Accordingly, Applicant maintains claims 1-4 and 7-11 now in this application should be allowable, thereby placing this application in condition for allowance. Notification of the same at an early date is courteously solicited.

September 24, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



Howard M. Ellis
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 25,856
(716)626-1564